DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 091 SP 027 387

AUTHOR Goodman, Jesse
TITLE Constructing a Practical Philosphy of Teaching: A Study of Preservice Teachers' Professional Perspectives.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th; San Francisco, CA, April 16-19, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Philosophy; *Education Majors; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study probed into the thinking and actions of preservice teachers in an effort to illuminate more clearly the nature of teaching perspectives. The study also investigated the way in which these students organized their perspectives into a practical philosophy of teaching. Psychosocial dynamics underlying the development of the students' perspectives were also examined. Observations of preservice elementary school teachers, and interviews with them, served as the two major means of data collection. Areas such as cooperation, authority, autonomy, self concept, and intuitive screens were investigated. Findings indicated that students' thinking was in a state of flux. Although some had notions of teaching before enrolling in the teacher education program, the ideas had not been systematically organized into a well-defended theory of teaching. It is concluded that significantly more in-depth research must be conducted on the complex occupational socialization of teachers. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268091

CONSTRUCTING A PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING:

A STUDY OF PRESERVICE TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Jesse Goodman
341 Wright Education Building
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Goodman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP027387

Constructing a Practical Philosophy of Teaching: A Study of Preservice Teachers' Professional Perspectives[1]

During the last decade, a number of educators have suggested that before we can significantly improve teacher preparation, we must first gain insight into the thinking, rather than just the behavior, of future teachers. That is, there is a need to understand the way in which students develop a practical philosophy of teaching. Unlike more traditional conceptions of philosophy which represents the work of academics who examine the intricacies of previous philosophical thought prior to offering new insights, a "practical" philosophy emerges from an individual's personal experience and is used as a guide for one's actions. Several studies of occupational socialization (e.g., Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Bucher & Stelling, 1977; Lortie, 1975; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) have found that the professional ideas which guide subsequent behavior are often formed early in one's career. It follows, then, that a crucial period for examining the development of teachers' practical philosophy of teaching is during their preservice education.

In response, several researchers have begun to examine the teaching perspectives students develop during their professional preparation (e.g., Adler, 1984; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1984; Gibson, 1976; Ginsburg & Newman, 1982; Goodman, 1985a; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Hammersley, 1977; Janesick, 1978; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). Becker and his colleagues (1961: 34) define perspectives as, "a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation." Unlike more abstract constructs such as attitudes or values, perspectives have reference to particular phenomena and include an individual's actions rather than just his/her disposition to act. Teaching perspectives take into account how situations within classrooms are experienced; how these situations are interpreted given the teacher's previous experiences, beliefs, and assumptions; and how these interpretations are

manifested in behavior. Students construct a practical philosophy of teaching by integrating their professional perspectives into a unified system of thought and action. The above mentioned research into students' teaching perspectives is important for it allows us to move beyond the assumption that students' thinking can be adequately captured by static dichotomies such as traditional versus progressive, conservative versus liberal, or custodian versus humanistic.

While this research has been insightful, too often it has relied on conceptual categories that have emerged from the researcher's mind rather than the linguistic framework of the informants, themselves. As a result, we know little about the way students conceptualize their own professional perspectives. How do students go about constructing a practical philosophy of teaching? What linguistic categories do students use to give meaning to their actions? What dynamics take place within an individual as s/he develops a given perspective towards teaching? In an effort to address the above questions and contribute to the growing body of literature in teacher socialization/preparation, this paper will report the findings of an ethnographic study that explored the professional perspectives of students enrolled in a large, state supported teacher education program. The goal of this study was to probe deeply into the thinking and actions of perservice teachers in an effort to illuminate more clearly the nature of teaching perspectives than previously has been reported in the literature. As part of this work, the study also investigated the way in which students organized their perspectives into a practical philosophy of teaching. Second, the paper will examine the psycho-social dynamics that underlie the development of the students' perspectives. Finally, it will discuss the implications of these findings for teacher education and research.

Methodology

The rationale behind choosing one methodology over another is connected to

the nature of the subject being studied and the underlying goal(s) of the research. Weber's (1977) notion of "Verstehen" was particularly helpful in guiding the purpose of this study. Through empathic understanding and direct experience of the social world, one is able to gain insight into a given social phenomenon. Since this study explored the complex interconnection between people's beliefs and actions, a methodology that incorporated the existential experiences of the participants, themselves (i.e., their language, actions, thoughts, feelings, and perceptions), as a major focus for investigation and interpretation was necessary. As a result, the methods used to collect and analyze data were those associated with qualitative field studies (e.g., Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Hansen, 1979; Pelto & Pelto, 1979; Spradley, 1979). This methodology was use because it is free to combine a variety of data gathering methods, and it allows for the generation of analysis concerning the professional perspectives of teachers which is grounded in recorded data.

Setting and Sample Selection

The sample was located in the Elementary Education Program (EEP) at State U., a university located in the southeastern part of the United States. (All proper names are fictitious.) Unlike many teacher education programs that developed without any well defined theoretical perspective, or those that emerged with a behavioral approach (Elam, 1971; Joyce, Yarger, Howey, Harbeck, & Kluwin, 1977), the EEP evolved from humanistic principles of education. The founders of the program mentioned the writings of Combs (1965), Maslow (1977), Sarason, Davidson, and Blatt (1962), Wass, Blume, Combs, and Hedges (1974), and other humanistic educators as the inspiration of their early efforts. Having students develop a "teaching philosophy" was an important programmatic goal. As stated in the EEP Student Handbook, one of the primary purposes of the program was "to help each student discover his own personal meanings through exploration of self as well as

ideas and experiences he has been exposed to."

Nearly all the students enrolled in the EEP came from the southeastern United States; however, they reflected a variety of social, economic, and cultural backgrounds. Each student was at least a junior in college; most were between the ages of twenty and twenty-five; and approximately 95 per cent were women. An initial group of twenty three students was randomly selected. After securing case histories, twelve students were chosen as the primary, although not exclusive, sample group. Care was taken to include students at different levels of their professional education, from a diversity of backgrounds, who expressed varied interests, and of different ages and sex. These individuals were selected following the guidelines of theoretical sampling; that is, on the assumption that differences among the participants would facilitate the discovery of theoretical questions, categories, and interrelationships (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Methods for Data Collection

Observations and interviews (both formal and informal) were the two main methods of data collection. In addition, the program's literature was reviewed (e.g., student and faculty handbooks, articles written by faculty members, university catalogue, weekly newsletter). Data were recorded during two university quarters, a period of six-months.

Each student in the sample group was observed as s/he participated in the EEP's three components: early field experiences and/or student teaching (Goodman, 1985), university education courses (Goodman, 1983), and weekly seminar meetings (Goodman, 1984). In addition, students were observed as they informally interacted in the hallways, university library, and student/faculty lounge. The purpose of these observations was to discover what actually happened in these settings. Rather than predetermining specific items to look for, a number of general questions were used initially to guide these observations: How are these

components organized? What type of interpersonal dynamics exist between the students and their pupils, cooperating teachers, university faculty members, and each other. What information, opinions, and/or beliefs are exchanged between the participants? More specific observation questions were developed from reviewing field notes and were used as the basis for follow-up observations.

In-depth interviews (e.g., Bussis, Chittenden, & Amarel, 1976; Spradley, 1979) were conducted with students in the sample group on a weekly or bi-weekly basis as they participated in the program's components. Often individuals were interviewed shortly before and/or after a specific seminar meeting, university class period, or field experience observation. The author also participated in informal, on-going discussions among students as they ate lunch in the student/faculty lounge, waited for classes to begin in the hallways, or worked on assignments together in the library. At first, interviews did not have specific, predetermined questions, but were structured around various areas of concern such as: the purpose of what they were doing, perceptions of what happens during the program's components, and individual responses to the people and events found within the EEP. As field notes were analyzed, more specific questions emerged and were then asked during interviews to gain deeper insight into situations and to clarify ambiguities. Responses from the sample group were continually cross-checked through bi-weekly interviews with ten randomly chosen students enrolled in the EEP. In addition, regular interviews were conducted with the university faculty who taught in the EEP and cooperating teachers and principals who worked in the practicum sites. Interviews were designed to discover the way in which informants interpreted the social world around them, and the way these interpretations were used as the basis for their actions.

Analysis

This study was guided by principles of "ethnographic semantics" in which the

meaning the informants gave to their verbal expression became the primary focus for investigation (Spradley, 1979; Spradley & McCurdy, 1972). The "constant comparative" method of analysis was used to develop an understanding of the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). Throughout the field work, interview and observation notes were reviewed daily. Incidents and items of information were at first coded into tentative conceptual categories. As these categories emerged, questions arose that were used to guide further investigation into the field. The findings from these investigations were then compared to the initial categories. Through this constant comparison of data, working categories crystallized. For example, during initial observations and interviews, it seemed that the students were extremely concerned with issues of classroom control. More observations and interviews were conducted to check this hypothesis, and to explore exactly how their views influenced their actions. As these findings emerged from the field notes, they, too, were checked during interviews with students inside and outside the primary sample group. As a result, "Classroom Control" became a working category. During the final analysis, this working category (along with others) formed the basis for reporting one of the students' two perspectives, "Teaching as a Problem of Control."

As this analysis continued, special attention was given to data that challenged original conceptualizations (Erickson, 1973). For example, anomalies that appeared in the data made it clear that although students shared a common interest in classroom control, this was only one of three areas of concern that formed the basis for the perspective, "Teaching as a Problem of Control." This return to the data source, followed by modification and/or new generation of ideas, continued until the findings could be presented in some detail. Finally, the participants were given the opportunity to respond to the findings before a final draft of the study was written.

As suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967), the analysis presented in this paper takes a narrative form, using examples from the data to clarify concepts and to demonstrate the interrelationship between the analysis and social reality. From this perspective, analysis is not a static product. Instead, it is viewed as "an ever-developing entity" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 32).

Constructing a Practical Philosophy of Teaching

As Berger and Luckmann (1966) note, once individuals enter an existing institution, they often begin to express the views reflected in that institution. That is, they begin to speak a "common language." This phenomenon developed among the students enrolled in the EEP. Although there were a few exceptions, students verbalized a relatively homogeneous philosophy of teaching.

Students organized their philosophy of teaching around two broad perspectives ("Teaching as a Problem of Control" and "Teaching as the Facilitation of Children's Growth") that reflected the dilemmas that they were trying to resolve, or goals they were hoping to implement as future teachers. During interviews, conversations among students, and class and seminar discussions; key phrases were often expressed. As will be described, these key phrases reflected a set of "guiding images" that became the core for the two teaching perspectives mentioned above. That is, students created various images about teaching and then synthesized these images into a coherent perspective.

Although students' practical philosophy of teaching was composed of these two perspectives, after extensive observations and interviews it became clear that individual students interpreted the "guiding images" within these perspectives in their own unique manner. It often seemed that two or more students agreed with each other's philosophy of teaching in the sense that they expressed similar beliefs to explain their actions. However, the substantive meaning behind a given verbal expression often varied, depending upon the individual student. As a

result, students' teaching strategies reflected the interpretation each individual gave to the "guiding images" within each perspective.

Teaching as a Problem of Control

Control was the major issue in the minds of the students within the EEP. A week did not pass without the word, "control," being spoken within some context. When asked what was the most important thing students needed to learn during their preservice education; students, cooperating teachers and principals, and university faculty members almost unanimously mentioned the "problem of control." Students quickly learned that while they could "get by" with mediocre organization, planning, curriculum development, and many other aspects of teaching, their ability to "be in control" had to be assured by graduation.

The casual observer might get the impression that the EEP was fixated on some Machiavellian obsession for power. However, the emphasis on control was more complex than a simple striving for power over children. "Teaching as a Problem of Control" emerged from a synthesis of three guiding images: cooperation, authority, and autonomy. While everyone agreed that it was necessary for a teacher to "have control," the purpose and meaning of this perspective depended upon individual students' subjective understanding of the above mentioned images.

Cooperation

Clearly, one important aspect of this perspective involved the need to control the pupils within a given classroom. However, students were not merely interested in "controlling kids;" rather, they were teaching their pupils how to "cooperate." This image of cooperation was interpreted by students in two distinctive ways. For most students, teaching children to cooperate meant teaching them to follow a set of prescribed rules deemed necessary for the smooth operation of classroom activity. Often these rules were posted.

> One of the bulletin boards listed the "Golden Rules of the Classroom:" 1) Stay at your own desk unless you are asked to move, 2) Don't run, 3) Only

> talk when an adult gives you permission, 4) Do not leave class without asking, 5) Use a quiet voice when you are inside, 6) Remember to wash your hands before lunch, 7) Positively no talking in the halls, 8) Respect all adults. During the day, these rules were referred to twice in an effort to keep order among the children. When asked why these rules were necessary, Mary (the student-teacher) replied, "It takes a lot of time to teach these kids how to cooperate and by putting them (the rules) up on the board there's no room for arguments or excuses like, 'But I didn't know we had to...' If you don't make things really clear to the kids, it isn't fair, and you're asking for a lot of trouble. (observation and interview with Mary)

Mary's approach for teaching children how to cooperate was common. Most students felt that the purpose of instruction was to get the children through a predetermined curriculum within a prespecified time period (see Goodman, 1985). If this goal was not achieved, many students feared it was because they did not have enough control over the children. As a result, the goal of many students was to make clear to the pupils what constituted good versus bad (usually referred to as "inappropriate") behavior and then develop some system to enforce the rules. While they preferred to use non-punitive methods for enforcing classroom rules, a number of students mentioned that through their field experiences they "realized" the necessity of being "firm." All but one cooperating teacher interviewed supported this contention.

Although the term "cooperation" was often used during seminar meetings, class sessions, and in interviews; few students (or their cooperating teachers) discussed this image with their pupils. The purpose, rationale, and consequences of classroom behavior were not open for dialogue. However, most students agreed with Joyce when she said, "Pupils should have a voice in what happens in the classroom" (participant in group interview at a seminar meeting). When this questioning was pursued, the students mentioned four reasons why it did not occur: 1) the cooperating teacher would not allow it, 2) there was no time for these types of discussions, 3) these discussions often confuse children, 4) only mature children (which none of them had) are able to seriously discuss this concern. For whatever reason, most students' image of cooperation was viewed exclusively as a

teacher concern.

While most students' view of cooperation reflected an emphasis on the establishment and enforcement of specific classroom rules, a few students' image of cooperation reflected a different point of view. To these individuals, teaching children to cooperate implied helping them understand the nature of group living. They were seriously concerned about giving pupils a voice in deciding the regulations of their classrooms, and helping children to view themselves not only as individuals, but as members of a larger community.

> The children were given a math assignment to do on their own or with a classmate. Kate (the student teacher) was helping individuals. After about ten minutes the noise level was making it difficult to hear, and a number of the children were running around the room and playing instead of working on the assignment. Kate called the class together on the rug and lead a discussion about what was happening. A number of topics were discussed: the difference between working and playing with a classmate, respecting other people's need for a reduced noise level when working, the hour of the afternoon, and the difficulty of the assignment. Throughout this discussion, Kate encouraged the children to express their ideas even if they were critical of the assignment. She also reminded the children to listen not only to her, but to the other children in the class, and discussed why this communication was important. (observation of Kate)

For the majority of students, the image of cooperation was limited to technical concerns about "how to" control the children in their classrooms. Both their practicum experiences and seminar meetings generally supported this focus (see Goodman, 1984, 1985). In contrast, students like Kate wanted to establish a sense of community among the pupils in their classrooms. While these individuals were committed to giving children "as much freedom as possible," they still felt a need "to control the kids" (interview with Alice). When exercising this control in their practicum sites, these students later expressed ethical concerns: Were their demands upon children reasonable and worthwhile? Were they treating the children with respect? When challenged, were they being fair and listening to the children's point of view? Were they trying to understand the complexities of the children and the situation? Although most students found acceptable answers

(discipline techniques) for controlling children, this questioning added complexity to their image of cooperation and required students to tolerate the ambiguity that comes from serious reflection upon a given issue.

> Even though I'm graduating now, I still have a lot of questions about discipline. Most teachers employ some form of threat to control the class. I liked what Mrs. T. (her cooperating teacher) did. When things got out of control we called everyone together and talked about what was going on. But sometimes I felt that "getting into group" was just another form of mild punishment. At times the kids listened and talked and really good stuff came out, but other times no one paid much attention. There is a thin line between leading a class and being autocratic. There is also a thin line between freedom and permissiveness. To tell you the truth, I just don't know where I'm at. I don't want to do it (discipline) like most teachers I've seen. I just hope I'll be able to do it differently once I get a job. (interview with Kate)

This uncertainty was difficult for most students because of the considerable pressure to have one's "discipline style" perfected by the time they graduated.

Authority

Part of the complexity inherent in the perspective, "Teaching as a Problem of Control," came from the students' images of authority. All students wanted authority over the children in their practicum sites, but here again, their interpretation of this image varied significantly among individuals. Most students strived for "institutional authority." Often when discussing discipline problems, students mentioned that they weren't seen as "the teacher" in the eyes of their pupils. "It's one thing for the kids to ignore something I've told them to do, and another thing for them to ignore a command from the teacher" (interview with Kim). These students felt that this label, with its implied authority of the school and educational system, would help them gain control over their children. Cooperating teachers and seminar leaders often supported this perception. If a student was having trouble maintaining order in the classroom, instead of exploring the situation and/or the student's attitudes, feelings, ideas, goals, and behavior; students were told that when they "become the teacher" disciplining the children would be easier.

Other students interpreted this image differently. They wanted authority over their children, but they didn't want to be an "authority figure." In lieu of institutional power, these individuals seemed to want "personal authority." Instead of getting power from the educational system, they wanted the children to give them power based upon their personality, age, knowledge base, and/or ability to relate to their pupils. A few students actually saw the label of "teacher" as a hindrance to their power.

> The kids listen to me a lot better than they do her (the cooperating teacher). (She was asked why.) Maybe it's because they don't see me as "the teacher." I'm not this big, heavy authority figure in their eyes. I think it's helped me develop a better rapport with them, and so they do what I ask without a big power struggle developing. Because I'm a student-teacher, it's kind of like I'm one of them, but not really. It's hard to explain. (interview with Alice)

These students were struggling to find a way to develop their authority from inside versus outside the classroom.

The most overt difference between individuals such as Alice and those who wanted institutional authority was that the latter group felt much more threatened by pupil rebellion. As agents of the institution, most students felt they had to defend the policies and classroom procedures of the system. Organizational structure and curricular demands from the school system were taken for granted and were not connected to the problem of control. When conflict arose, the children (or their families) were often seen as "the problem," instead of a single component in a broader social context. In contrast, the few students who wanted personal authority saw children's "misbehavior" as partly stemming from an overly structured institution.

> When you stop to think about it, it just isn't natural to have children spend the majority of the day inside, at a desk, doing paperwork. Kids need a lot of fresh air and activity. I think a lot of discipline problems arise from just keeping children inside all day. (interview with Judy)

Since these students did not view the school system as benign nor themselves as merely agents of that system, they did not feel they had to defend the institution

at all costs. As a result, when conflict emerged they did not view the children as "the problem," but as only one aspect of a broader situation.

Most students had a desire to have both institutional and personal authority over children. A number of individuals wanted to find the balance between being a "friend" to their pupils and at the same time remain "the teacher." However, institutional authority tended to create distance between the student and their pupils, and thus, this balance was difficult to obtain. Students were often warned by cooperating teachers and principals not be become "too friendly" with the pupils. Since it was difficult to be both a friend and a teacher, most students opted for the security of institutional rather than personal authority.

Autonomy

Concern for developing a sense of community and personal authority among some students gave rise to another guiding image of the perspective, "Teaching as a Problem of Control," that had little to do with discipline. Teacher autonomy became a concern for a small group of students. For these individuals, "wanting control" meant having control over the classroom environment; not just the children within it. The reason behind this desire for control was that students rarely had actual control over what happened in their practicum sites. As one student said, "You never forget that you're in someone else's classroom" (participant in group interview at a seminar meeting). Students were always trying to operate under another person's standards, expectations, routines, attitudes, and objectives. "Having control" was like a piece of candy always held just out of the child's (student's) reach. The curriculum and nature of instruction in most practicum sites was specifically predetermined, highly structured, and mechanistic. There were few opportunities to implement teaching strategies that encouraged pupil problem-solving, self-directed learning and research, and/or thoughtful interpretation and expression of content (see Goodman,

1985). For those students who wanted to try alternatives to what was happening in most classrooms, this desire for control was acute.

> I would love to get a job where I had a lot of say-so for my class. I'm not one for teaching right out of the book. I like to get the kids involved as much as possible. Maybe they could even plan some of the curriculum. I would like to have as much control over my class as possible. (anonymous response to questionnaire)

To most students, "survival" referred to their ability to have the children "move" through the curriculum on time and in a smooth, quite fashion. "Survival" to students who sought more autonomy referred to their concern for "doing what I want" without being reprimanded for not following set procedures.

> What scares me the most is that I'll end up getting coopted. Now I'm saying that I can't do what I want because I'm in someone else's classroom. Then I won't be able to do what I want my first year or two of teaching because I won't have job security. I'm just afraid that by then, I won't remember what it is I wanted to do in the first place. (interview with Bob)

For some students, "Teaching as a Problem of Control" not only reflected a concern over their interpersonal relationships with children, but also their relationship with the power structures that influence the education found in most schools.

Teaching as the Facilitation of Children's Growth

The other major perspective that formed the basis for the students' practical philosophy of teaching concerned children's growth. "Growth" was the most common metaphor students used to describe the process of education. As previously mentioned, the EEP was based upon principles of humanistic education, and this metaphor was often used in the program's literature. When asked, most students said good teachers were "facilitators of children's growth" (interview with Mary). As this perspective was more deeply examined, two guiding images emerged: "individualization" and "self-concept." As with the previous perspective, students created different meanings of these images.

Individualization

The term, "individualization," was often heard in relation to children's

growth. For most students, this term reflected an image of a child working independently on tasks especially designed for him/her. All the public schools in which students were placed used "Skills Development" programs for reading, grammar, and math. These subjects dominated the daily curriculum, and students were told that these programs were especially designed to meet the children's "individual needs" (observation of Ms. J's, a cooperating principal, initial comments to student-teachers). For example, in reading, children worked in their own workbook and at their own pace. If the children did not pass the test at the end of a given chapter, they worked on "Booster Activities." These worksheets were designed to pinpoint and drill each child on the specific skill(s) s/he needed to "master" as identified by the test. Thus, one child might be working on one "skill" and another child a different "skill" during the same class period. Most students took the standard curriculum and nature of instruction for granted. To them, pupil growth depended upon helping them complete the required seatwork on time and improving their test scores. In this manner, students could actually "see" the children's growth.

> I've spent most of my time this semester working with Tim, and it really feels good to see how his work (test scores) has gone up. Individual attention is so important. He's really grown a lot this semester. (observation of Sally's end-of-quarter conference with her seminar leader)

In order to "facilitate" this growth, students were observed spending considerable effort at perfecting their managerial skills such as organizing small group and individual instruction, keeping pupils busy with seatwork when not in group instruction, maintaining records of everyone's progress (schoolwork), and keeping students quiet and "on task" (see Goodman, 1985). As a result of this instructional system, many students mentioned they felt the standard curriculum promoted the "growth of each individual" (interview with Pam).

It is important to note that many students also expressed the belief that "individualization" had something to do with being aware of children's interests.

However, it was difficult to ascertain what role the "children's interests" actually played in the students' teaching. When asked to clarify their ideas, most responses were equally vague. "Like if a kid is interested in cars maybe you could plan to do something in class that would deal with this topic" (interview with Adrian). Students were rarely observed teaching a lesson that incorporated their pupil's interests. As students became more familiar with institutional expectations through their various field experiences, the connection between "individualization" and "pupils' interests" became less significant.

> The discussion centered on the problem of motivating pupils to read, (i.e. finish their assigned workbook pages). A number of suggestions were made. Robin then shared that in her reading group she let the kids tell personal stories, and at the end of the period she hadn't finished the assignment. She felt she had failed. The next time she was "a lot firmer" and didn't let the pupils wander from their reading. She finished the assigned story, the pupils finished their workbooks, and she felt much better. (observation and summary of seminar meeting)

Integrating children's comments into the teaching of reading could be an effective motivating factor for pupil learning. However, because this activity might hamper "getting through the material," it was not considered a viable teaching strategy. While many students <u>believed</u> in the value of considering "pupil's interests" as a way to individualize their instruction, their actions did not reflect their concern.

While the "individualized" curriculum found in the practicum sites was accepted by most students as valid, a few individuals questioned its legitimacy. For these people, "individualizing" instruction implied being aware of the unique ways in which different pupils learn. These students were critical of the workbooks, drilling, and testing that dominated the curriculum and instructional procedures within their field placements. Much of what happened in the practicum sites seemed overly standardized and boring to them. "It doesn't take long to realize that mostly the kids do the same thing every day - drilling and testing, drilling and testing. After a while, its gets pretty monotonous" (interview with

Kate). Fostering children's unique contributions to the learning process was one avenue for implementing their concerns.

> I try to find ways in which each kid is special. For example, in class discussions when someone says something that sounds weird, I try to pick up on that and draw the kid out by asking him or her to speak some more on the topic, or I'll ask a specific question to get more information. It's amazing what some of these kids will come up with. I really try to teach kids that having strange ideas is okay. (interview with Alice)

Alice, Kate, and Judy expressed disappointment with the subjects being taught in most classrooms. For them, not enough attention was being given to developing the children's originality and unique ways of learning. During their practicum experiences, Kate and Judy were observed implementing units of study that they developed themselves (see Adler & Goodman, 1985; Goodman, 1985). In these units there was a conscious effort made to "individualize" their instruction.

> When you've got 25 to 30 kids in your class, there's no way you can really come up with an individual approach for each one. So (in her unit) I made sure I had a different types of learning activities such as art projects, oral reports, and visual demonstrations as well as reading and writing. In this way, if one kid had difficulty learning about ecology through the reading materials, he had other opportunities such as class discussions, film strips, guest speakers, or even looking at photographs. While everyone had to participate in each activity, they got the chance to spend most of their time (learning about this topic) in the way that matched their learning style. (interview with Judy)

These students' image of "individualization" directly challenged the standard curriculum and nature of instruction found in most practicum sites. Although they often felt constrained in what and how they could teach in their practicum sites, each expressed hope that when they became employed, they would be able to increase their ability to individualize their instruction.

Self-Concept

Another image that emerged within the perspective, "Teaching as the Facilitation of Children's Growth," was the notion of children's "self-concept." Each student interviewed said that education should involve "more than just the academics" (interview with Alice), and each expressed a concern for helping

children "grow as people" (interview with Nancy). Slogans such as "educating the whole child," "relating to the children's needs," and "affective education" could be heard in both seminar meetings (see Goodman, 1984) and university class sessions (see Goodman, 1983). Students unanimously agreed that good teachers should improve the self-concept of children (response to questionnaire).[2]

For most students, enhancing a child's self-concept was primarily an interpersonal concern. A number of students mentioned that teachers could help improve a child's self-image by being warm, friendly, and nice to him/her. They said it was important to genuinely like children and say positive things about them, if one was going to be a teacher. The majority of students saw little connection between teaching strategies and the children's self-concept. For those individuals who did see some connection, it was limited to making sure pupils were given some opportunity to "succeed" within the given curriculum and instructional design found in their field placements.

> There are a couple of kids who fail just about every assignment. So I made up a special worksheet that I knew they would get almost everything right. Kids get discouraged if they are never given a chance to do well. I think success is really important for your self-concept. (interview with Diane)

In order to improve children's self-perception, a number of students said that teachers should "not just point out children's mistakes but also recognize their correct answers" (interview with Robin). For the majority of students, the notion of "developing a child's self-concept" implied that a teacher should be "positive" in their verbal communication with children and was only minimally connected to the daily instructional routine.

Other students' image of developing a child's self-concept was more substantive and had definite instructional and/or curricular implications. A couple of students mentioned that "traditional schooling" often gave children a bad self-concept "by focusing on what children don't know instead of what they do know" (interview with Judy). As a result, many children are covertly taught that

what they know isn't worthwhile; therefore, they learn that they aren't very intelligent. These students felt that the drillwork found in most practicum sites didn't "do much" to help children appreciate themselves or their abilities (interview with Alice and Judy). In response, they expressed the need to develop learning activities that would enhance the children's self-esteem as "learners."

> Our class was studying immigration, and I had each kid interview their grandparents or parents to find out what cultural background they came from, when and why their ancestors immigrated to this country, and what it was like for them coming over once they got here. It was neat because while we were learning about immigration, the kids were also learning a lot about their family history. The kids were excited....because they were the ones doing the teaching; not me. (interview with Alice)

Kate often talked about the importance of living in a pluralistic society that was tolerant of different cultural backgrounds and unique life styles.

> Society projects an ideal man and woman for the rest of us to model. There's all this emphasis on looking the right way, wearing the right clothes, being the right color, and living the right way. I find that whole mentality to be unhealthy, and I think teachers should try to counteract these messages. (interview with Kate)

Rather than emphasizing external achievement and depending upon praise, Kate felt a child's self-concept was improved through self-acceptance and reflection. During a unit on "Senior Citizens" (see Goodman & Adler, 1985), Kate directly raised some of these issues.

> The children brought in two pictures of one of their grandparents (or some other relative or friend) that showed how they looked when they were young and old. The children were asked to identify ways in which these people had changed. One of the children said that her grandmother "used to be pretty," and Kate initiated a discussion with the class about the definition of beauty. They talked about: the children's images of "beautiful people," the role Hollywood and advertising played in shaping our conception of beauty, and how people "can be beautiful inside and outside." She ended the class period by having the children write poems in which each line began "I am beautiful because..." Later, Kate said, "Even though these kids are only in third grade, a lot of them have really poor self-concepts. Whenever I can, I try to get them to think about why so many people feel this way." (observation of and interview with Kate)

Although Kate's and Alice's attempts to directly relate the curriculum and nature of instruction to the children's self-concept was rare, their efforts are

noteworthy.

In summary, students within the EEP developed a practical philosophy of teaching comprised of two broad perspectives: "Teaching as a Problem of Control" and "Teaching as the Facilitation of Children's Growth." The first perspective was organized around guiding images of cooperation, authority, and autonomy. The images within the latter perspective were individualization and self-concept. While on the surface it seemed that these students shared a common philosophy, they uniquely interpreted these images, and thus their experience of becoming a teacher differered significantly.

Psycho-social Dynamics Underlying the Development of Students' Perspectives

One of the values of ethnographic study is that close examination of a singular setting can yield insights into the subtleties of social reality often missed in more generalized, quantitative research. In this way, our understanding of the social world can be refined. As previously mentioned, a small number of field studies have begun to give us insight into the perspectives preservice teachers develop as they become teachers (see page 1). Additional studies have given us some indication of the forces that influence students to hold certain perspectives (Zeichner, 1980). Biographical experiences prior to professional preparation (e.g., Lortie, 1975; Mardle & Walker, 1980; Petty & Hogben, 1980; Pruitt & Lee, 1978; Wright & Tuska, 1967; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984), cooperating teachers and other individuals with evaluative power (e.g., Egar & Warren, 1969; Iannaccone, 1963; Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Roberts & Blankenship, 1970; Yee, 1969), other students (e.g., Friebus, 1977; Iannaccone & Button, 1964), lay people (e.g., Johnston & Ryan, 1983; Karmos & Jacko, 1977), the ecology of the classroom (e.g., Copeland, 1980; Doyle, 1979; Fenstermacher, 1980; Goodman, 1985), and the institutional characteristics of schools (e.g., Dale, 1977; Hoy & Rees, 1977; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985) are some of the factors that have been

identified as having an impact on students' teaching perspectives. What is missing in the literature is some notion of the psycho-social dynamics that take place within students as they develop a given perspective towards teaching. That is, the way in which students process information and personal experiences as their perspectives are formed has yet to be portrayed. It is important to note that attempting this portrayal must be speculative. Tracing the multiple origins of a given set of ideas and actions is extremely difficult in that the students, themselves, were not always clear as to the way in which their perspectives evolved. Nonetheless, a pattern did emerge from the data.

Intuitive Screens

One might assume that a student's practical philosophy of teaching is formed as s/he is exposed to various viewpoints and experiences during his/her professional preparation. However, the findings of this study suggest that this assumption is too simplistic. Students did not enter the EEP tabula rasa. Early childhood and school experiences had a significant impact on the informants' professional perspectives. As children, students developed attitudes towards school and definitions of what it meant to be a "teacher" and a "pupil." They also formed conceptions of "school work," "learning," and "teaching" during these early ages. However, their notions of teaching were not generally formed as a rational activity during childhood. That is, most students did not indicate that they consciously thought about the particulars of what it might mean to become a teacher. Rather, their ideas seemed more intuitive than analytical. For example, one reason why most students interpreted concepts such as "growth" as improving test scores on standardized tests and "individualization" as drillwork was because "school work" was not very different from what they had known as children. As a result, they took what happened in their practicum sites for granted. Likewise, perceptions of themselves as young pupils had an affect upon their views of

"control." Kate, who described herself as a "slightly rebellious child," expressed a tolerance for children's rebellion against "unnecessary authority" (interview with Kate). Another student who remembered "what when on behind the teacher's back," said he would take measures to ensure that his pupils didn't repeat the same transgressions as he and his friends when they went to school (observation of informal student discussion).

Closely related to these early experiences, students' professional perspectives were influenced by the broader culture in which they were raised. Several scholars (e.g., Braverman, 1974; Clark, 1962; Henry, 1965; Lasch, 1975) have noted that since the turn of the century, this society has emphasized values of efficiency, science, and technology to an almost god-like status. Naturally, these values have been influential in the development of our educational system (e.g., Apple, 1982; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bullough, Goldstein, & Ladd, 1984; Callahan, 1963; Giroux, 1981). For example a technocratic view of curriculum and knowledge was represented in the field placements by breaking subject matter into a sequentially ordered series of separate tasks and "facts." The pre-test, drillwork, post-test process of instruction resembled the "scientific" process of quantitative research. Most students took the value of these practices for granted because it appealed to their "cultural logic." If one wanted to teach something to other people, it would be "just common sense" to: break the information up into discrete parts, drill them until they mastered these parts; and then test them to make sure they know it. This emphasis on pragmatism, sequential thought processes, technical mastery, and efficiency was applied to many aspects of the students' lives from cooking to playing music to buying groceries, and not just teaching and learning. The students' views of "control" also reflected their view of society as a whole. Some students stressed the need to teach children rules in order to teach them "how to get along in society"

(interview with Tom), while for other students the ideal of developing an atmosphere of freedom in their classrooms could be traced back to society's value of representative government. For example, Kate once mentioned that her approach to discipline would hopefully help "teach children how to live in a democratic society" (interview with Kate).

Early childhood, school, and societal experiences and values helped form within students a set of professional perspectives prior to entry into teacher education. However, students did not enter the EEP with a hardened set of professional opinions. Many students were not sure what they believed, and others who did have more fully developed notions were usually open to new ideas. The educational viewpoints with which students entered the EEP formed an "intuitive screen" through which they interpreted their professional education. Unlike glass which is rigid and does not allow wind, rain, and sound from entering, screens connote a separation from the outside world, but one that is more open to external stimuli. This is a useful metaphor for portraying the dynamics involved as students developed their perspectives of teaching within the EEP.

Once students entered the program these intuitive screens gave them an orientation point from which they made sense out of the activities and ideas presented to them. The alteration and/or reinforcement of prior perspectives resulted from their emotional as well as intellectual response to the people, settings, ideas, and experiences found in the EEP. For example, several students developed a desire for institutional authority and a "rule" orientation to classroom control because of their fears and insecurities; not because they believed in totalitarianism. Students expressed fears of: being criticized for not controlling the class, permissiveness and chaos, being taken advantage of by the pupils in their class, and not getting through the prescribed curriculum on time. These and other fears formed the basis for most students' image of

"cooperation." Likewise, students' sense of service came from having a "feeling for kids" (interview with Robin). Kate's desire to use her teaching to increase the tolerance for diverse ethnic groups and lifestyles came from a "sense" of social justice; not a well developed or articulated political/social ideology.

When exposed to new ideas or experiences, students tended to act first on an intuitive rather than intellectual level. No matter how logical or sound an idea seemed, if it went against a student's intuitive feelings, it was usually rejected. For example, a number of students expressed an attraction to the idea of "freedom to learn" within classrooms that was presented to them in a few of their university courses. However, their lack of previous exposure to this type of teaching, their fears of permissiveness, and lack of opportunity for experimentation in field placements (see Goodman, 1985); kept most of them from using this image as a core for their teaching perspectives.

It was not that students neglected to use their intelligence in deciding what made sense and what didn't. To the contrary, some individuals thought long and hard about what they were exposed to and what they were doing while in the EEP. As a group, the informants seemed fairly open-minded and willing to explore new ideas. If their beliefs were challenged in a non-threatening manner, most students seemed willing to seriously consider alternative points of view.

> The purpose of education has to be more than just teaching the basics. We live in a very complex society, and I think the most important thing is to help children cope with the difficulties of life. (She was asked, if society was so difficult to live in, why would one want to teach children merely to cope? Maybe it would be better to teach children how to transform the society they will enter as adults. She said she had never thought of that before and needed time to think it over. A few days later she returned.) I guess if a child wanted to transform the society that would be okay. I don't think I would actually teach that they should change things, but I would support them doing it if they felt it was important. (interview with Tina)

A number of the informants spent considerable effort intellectually analyzing a variety of ideas as they read books and articles, listened to lectures,

participated in discussions, had conferences with faculty members, completed assignments, and participated in field experiences.

The Interface of Past and Present: Some Illustrative Examples

The dynamics that underlie the development of a given student's practical philosophy of teaching is both subtle and complex. It involves prior conceptions based upon early childhood, school, and societal experiences; emotional reactions to present professional educational experiences; and thoughtful consideration of new ideas. Attempting to understand these dynamics can be difficult. A few concrete examples may help illustrate the dynamic event of developing a given professional perspective.

Although students had to meet a variety of external demands as set by university faculty and/or cooperating teachers, they were not always influenced in a significant way by meeting these expectations. Most students tended to be influenced by those people or experiences that legitimated their existing "intuitive screen." This connection between past views and present experience was usually on some broad conceptual level and rarely dealt with specifics. For example, Betty and a number of other students mentioned the influence of Dr. Heine, one of the reading professors. Prior to taking Dr. Heine's course, Betty complained that reading, as taught in her field experiences, seemed boring. "The kids do what they're suppose to (complete their reading assignments), but you can tell they're not really interested" (interview with Betty). Dr. Heine had good interpersonal relationships with his students, and he often expressed the view that reading should be "fun." To reach this goal, he would bring in games to stimulate children's interest in a particular reading skill. As a result, Betty was attracted to what Dr. Heine had to say in class. However, a serious analysis of the "skills development" approach to reading that was used in the public school, and how it generally failed to stimulate children's interest in reading

was not examined in Dr. Heine's course (see Goodman 1983, 1985). This absence was of little concern to Betty or most other students. The crucial point in Betty's mind was that a professor expressed an opinion that she also believed was important (i.e., reading should be fun). In this way, her initial conception was legitimated, and thus when the course was over Betty mentioned the impact Dr. Heine had had on her thinking.

Judy's experience in the EEP also reflected this dynamic. Judy was critical of the education she received as a child. She felt schools often taught children to dislike learning, and felt that the traditional curriculum which emphasized utilitarian skills and nature of instruction which emphasized drillwork and quantitative tests was vacuous. During our first interview she expressed a desire to teach in a creative way and to teach children something meaningful. She felt teachers should play a large role in making curricular and instructional decisions. However, after four quarters in the program, she was frustrated by the lack of creativity found in the field placements and the lack of substantive alternatives presented in university courses. During her final quarter prior to student teaching, Judy's seminar leader helped her get into a field placement where the cooperating teacher would support her desire to experiment with curriculum and alternative teaching strategies. In addition, one of her "methods" professors helped her develop and organize a unit of study on ecology in which she used several innovative resources and implemented a variety of stimulating learning activities (see Goodman, 1985a). At the end of the quarter she said, "This quarter has really had an impact on my teaching. It's made me see that teaching can be creative. It's also made me realize how much work it takes to do a really good job" (interview with Judy). During this quarter, Judy's "intuitive screen" had been significantly strengthened.

Although this reinforcement of previously held conceptions illustrates the

dynamics that underlay the development of most students' perspectives, there were a few occasions when a student's "screen" split apart as a result of new experiences and a significant shift in perspectives was noticeable. Mary experienced such a shift during her final two quarters in the program. At the beginning of Mary' s fifth quarter she expressed clear views about the need to individualize instruction for children. During her initial interview she said, "Everyone has different interests and learns in different ways. It's important for teachers to be sensitive to each child and gear your instruction him (her)." In her previous early field experiences, she had tutored several children, and she developed a close, rewarding relationship with them. "You can't really teach kids much unless you get to know them personally" (interview with Mary). During her fifth quarter's early field experience, she took much more responsibility for working with small groups and the whole class. As the quarter progressed, she expressed some frustration concerning her ability to develop a close rapport with the individual pupils in her practicum site. "There just isn't time to get to know everyone" (observation of Mary's participation in a seminar meeting). Nevertheless, she still valued the notion of "individualized instruction," and stated that the reading program "really helped because it's geared to the individual child" (interview with Mary). By the middle of her final student teaching experience (during her sixth quarter in the program), Mary had shifted her view of "individualizing instruction" from getting to know the children and their unique learning styles to effectively managing the daily curriculum. "They (worksheets) really help you know where everyone is at. Individuals who are having trouble in one (skill) area or another can get special attention by giving them the proper Booster Activity" (interview with Mary). Due to the number of children in her class and the need to get through the curriculum on time, the meaning Mary gave to the perspective, "Teaching as the Facilitation of Children's

Growth," made a significant shift during her last two quarters in the EEP.

Summary

While it was difficult to observe the psycho-social dynamics that underlay the development of students' professional perspectives, it was easy to see that these students' thinking was in a state of flux. Although most students had formed some notions of education and teaching prior to enrolling in the EEP, their ideas had not been systematically organized into a well defended theory of teaching. As a group, students seemed willing to explore new ideas. However, this openness was tempered by a need for security. Most informants were between the age of twenty and twenty-two. Few, as yet, had had the opportunity or inclination to seriously question their previous cultural background or notions of reality. While a few students were beginning this questioning now that they were away from home and on their own for the first time of their life, making major changes in their perspectives involved some risk taking. At any given time during their professional preparation, these students expressed vague and often contradictory views on various aspects of teaching and learning. On both an intuitive and analytical level, students were involved in an internal dialogue in which they were developing a practical philosophy of teaching. Most students seemed to continue this silent discourse up to and probably beyond their graduation.

Conclusions and Implications

Space does not allow for a full discussion of the implications, based upon the study's findings, for researchers and teacher educators. However, a number of conclusions are worth emphasizing.

Research

First, this study reinforces the value of using principles of "ethnographic semantics" and the construct of "perspectives" for understanding the professional

socialization of beginning teachers. Most research in this area has tended to focus on either attitudes or behaviors of prospective teachers. However, these studies have not been able to adequately capture the crucial interplay that exists between an individual's beliefs and actions. Examining students' attitudes or behavior alone actually explains little about the reality of becoming a teacher. For example, the students within the EEP expressed many of the same attitudes during initial interviews; however, when observed and later interviewed in their practicum sites it became clear that the meanings individual students gave to common beliefs varied substantially. Likewise, students often behaved in a similar manner, but the essence of their actions differed. For example, most students who had a "time out" corner in their field placements used them as a form of punishment for inappropriate behavior. Jean, however, used it as a place "where kids can go to cool down; not necessarily because they are bad" (interview with Jean). On the surface and from a distance, the use of a time out corner seemed similar, but the social reality of this interaction differed significantly among the informants. By focusing on the integration of an individuals' beliefs and actions and the meanings given to their experiences as a result of this integration, our understanding of teacher socialization can become more crystallized.

This study also illustrates the need for a dialectical approach to research on teacher socialization. Lortie (1973: 488) notes that the process of becoming a teacher is "complex....not readily captured by a simple, one factor frame of reference." As previously mentioned (see page 20), recent studies have begun to illuminate the various forces contributing to students' emerging role as teachers. However, most of these studies have maintained a functionalist orientation towards occupational socialization.[3] That is, students are basically portrayed as passive entities who merely adjust to outside forces. In studies

that focus on biographical factors, students are molded by the past, whereas in studies that emphasize institutional factors, they are pressed into shape by the present. In either case, the student is not seen as an active force contributing to his/her own occupational identity.

The findings of this study strongly challenge this functionalist view of teacher socialization. Students played an active role in developing their practical philosophy of teaching. While biographical and institutional factors influenced students' perspectives, these individuals were not sculptured into a given predetermined form by external forces. Rather the interaction between external factors and internal directedness reflected the "soft-determinism" presented in Olesen and Whittaker's (1968) study of nursing students.

> [S]tudents....participate in their own education by making choices to meet faculty demands, to handle non-institutional pressures, and to work out situations of their own creating. Students may choose foolishly or wisely, depending on the perspective they or the faculty take. They may later regret or be satisfied with their choices, but they are constantly choosing among the degrees and ranges of alternatives open to them and those which they open for themselves in the institutional setting. (p. 7)

This dialectical relationship between external demands and student directed action could be observed in a number of instances as students developed their perspectives. For example, students often modeled the teaching techniques of and expressed similar ideas as their cooperating teachers. However, this modeling was rarely complete. Instead of being a "carbon copy" of a particular individual, each student picked specific characteristics from a variety of individuals (cooperating teachers, seminar leaders, "methods" instructors, parents, etc.) as they put together their own professional identity. Several students engaged in "wishful thinking," in their practicum sites. When not busy, they were observed daydreaming how they would do things "if this was my class" (interview with Vicki). In addition, a few students sought out those cooperating teachers, seminar leaders, and "methods" instructors who would support their efforts to experiment

and alter traditional practices (see Goodman, 1985a). The students in this study were clearly involved in creating the existential experiences from which their professional perspectives emerged.

A dialectical view of occupational socialization recognizes the way in which individuals exercise freedom to manipulate their professional situations while at the same time being constrained by them. As the findings of this study illuminate, students engaged in a continual process of interpretation of past and present events as they created meanings about those events. During this process of "becoming a teacher," students are carried on an internal dialogue in which they made sense out of the "world" that surrounded them. As a result, by the time they graduated from the EEP, the vast majority of students stated that they felt their practice generally reflected their philosophy of teaching. If we are to truly understand what happens during the occupational socialization of teachers, then we must adopt an approach to research that allows us access into this internal dialogue.

Teacher Education

The findings of this study would suggest that the dominant view of "good teaching" needs to be altered radically. Traditionally, good teaching has been viewed as the mastery of specific techniques of practice. As a result, teacher preparation programs have generally focused on teaching students specific "methods" or behaviors. Students learn to plan lessons, lead small groups, grade tests and literally hundreds of other techniques in their preparation courses and field experiences. While much of this information is valuable, unfortunately, this focus has been extremely narrow. Learning to become a teacher is a complex process of socialization that involves an individual's thoughts, feelings, perceptions, values, and actions. Teacher education programs cannot be adequately developed if the focus is only on students' behavior.

The results of this study would support those who argue that reflective inquiry be at the heart of teacher education (e.g., Bagenstos, 1975; Dewey, 1904; Elliot, 1977; Feiman, 1979; Goodman, 1984; Salzillo & Van Fleet, 1977; Scheffler, 1968, Zeichner, 1981). The findings suggest that preparation programs develop strategies for helping students reflect upon their own and their fellow students' perspectives. This reflection must include more than just what individuals "believe." Just asking students to verbalize their ideas is not enough. As previously described, most of the students in the EEP verbally expressed very similar beliefs about teaching, but in reality had differing perspectives. It is important for teacher education to help students consider the meaning they place upon their words, how these meanings may differ among a given group of individuals, and what experiences influence their ideas and actions. As Dewey (1904) noted, it is only through this type of substantive reflection that the growth of future teachers can be enhanced.

In recent years, there have been several programmatic efforts at increasing students' ability to develop this "habit of reflection" (Dewey, 1904). Seminar meetings (e.g., Combs, 1965, Sarason, Davidson & Blatt, 1962; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982), "methods" courses (e.g., Adler, 1984a; Cohn & Gellman, 1985; Goodman, 1986; Mazza, 1984), and field experiences (e.g., Goodman, in press; Martin, 1984; Zeichner, 1981) have all been cited as possible avenues for promoting substantive reflection among students. Specific strategies have also been described in an effort to obtain this goal. For example, Taxel (1982) describes a language arts "methods" course which analyzes children literature for possible sexist implications. As part of this inquiry, students reflect upon their own experience as children who are exposed to these unhealthy messages and images and well as their role as future teachers who will use children's literature in their classes. Gitlin and Teitelbaum (1983) discuss the use of

having students do mini-ethnographic studies as a catalyst for helping them reflect upon "classroom life." The primary value of this assignment, according to the authors, is having students learn how to view reality from a variety of perspectives. This conscious manipulation of viewpoints helps students reflect upon their own professional perspectives as they begin their careers. Goodman (1986) outlines a "critical" approach to designing curriculum that is taught to preservice teachers as part of a social studies "methods" course. As part of this course, students reflect upon a variety of issues including: the role of teachers as curriculum developers, the nature of social knowledge, definitions of learning, and the politics of teaching. While different in scope and form, each of these strategies are designed to help students go beyond merely expressing their "views on teaching." Instead, the goal is to facilitate students' thinking within a personally meaningful and substantive forum. The findings of this study would support more efforts in this direction.

Finally, as teacher educators, we need to examine the relationship between our own goals and the social reality within our programs. As previously mentioned, the EEP was based upon principles of humanistic education. One of the primary goals of this program was to help students develop a philosophy of teaching. Many humanistic ideals such as "growth," "cooperation," "individualization," and "self-concept" were often heard in seminar meetings and class sessions. However, there was little genuine reflection about the meanings that individuals gave to these images. As a result, these terms became little more than rhetorical slogans that could be used to justify and explain a wide variety of actions. This is not to suggest that the problem then becomes one of getting people to accept and act upon the "true" intent of a given philosophy. No matter how noble a set of principles may sound, if it is rigidly interpreted and forced upon people, it becomes dogma. Nevertheless, program goals should not be

taken for granted. In examining teacher education, we need more research that illuminates the complexities of "becoming a teacher." Do students in other programs develop similar perspectives as the students in the EEP? Do students in other programs share a common language system, but with different meanings given to their verbal expressions? Are the dynamics that underlie the development of a given set of perspectives different from those found in the EEP? If we wish to substantively educate future teachers and not just technically train them, it is important to go beyond the stated principles, goals, and intentions of a given program and explore the empirical reality of teacher education as it unfolds over time. Developing quality teacher education programs requires more than just a conceptual framework. It is equally important to see how these intentions are manifested.

Notes

[1] To enhance the reading of this paper, the following word guide is provided: Educator- one who teaches or supervises students at the college level; Student- one who is enrolled in a teacher preparation program; Pupil- a child enrolled in an elementary or middle school.

[2] Students in each of the five seminar groups were given a questionnaire which recorded their responses (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) to twenty five statements regarding the qualities that reflect "a good teacher" (e.g., Good teachers develop each child's self-concept. Good teachers develop their own curriculum. Good teachers have a firm grip on discipline.).

[3] There are a few notable exceptions to this statement. Recently there have been some studies in both Europe and the United States that have given us a dialectical portrayal of teacher socialization (e.g., Anderson, 1974, Goodman, 1985; Lacey, 1977; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985).

References

Adler, S. (1984). A field study of selected student teacher perspectives toward social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education 12, 1, 13-30.

Adler, S. (1984a). Critical consciousness in the social studies methods class. Paper presented at the annual National Council of the Social Studies meeting, Washington, D.C.

Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bagenstos, N. (1975). Teacher as an inquirer. The Educational Forum. 39, 231-237.

Becker, H (1961). Boys in white: Student culture in medical school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977). Reproduction in education, society, and culture. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Braverman, H. (1974). Labor and monopoly capital. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bucher, R. & Stelling, J. (1977). Becoming professional. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bullough, R., Goldstein, S., & Holt, L. Human interests in the curriculum: Teaching and learning in a technological society. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bussis, A., Crittenden, E., & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Callahan, R. (1963). Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, B. (1962). Educating the expert society. San Francisco: Chandler.

Cohn, M. & Gellman, V. (1985). Supervision: A developmental approach for fostering inquiry in pre-service teacher education. Paper presented at the annual

American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago.

Combs, A. (1965). The professional education of teachers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Copeland, W. (1980). Student teacher and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory Into Practice, 18, 3, 194-199.

Dale, R. (1977). Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield: Nafferton Books.

Dewey, J. (1904). The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. In The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers (Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Co.

Doyle, W. (1979). Classroom effects. Theory Into Practice 18, 138-144.

Edgar, D. & Warren, R. (1969). Power and autonomy in teacher socialization. Sociology of Education, 42, 386-399.

Elam, S. (1971). Performance based teacher education: What state the art? Paper for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Committee on Performance Based Teacher Education.

Elliott, J. (1976). Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the work of the ford teaching project. Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 7, 2, 2-22.

Erickson, F. (1973). What makes school ethnography "ethnographic?" Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 4, 2, 10-19.

Feiman, S. (1979). Technique and inquiry in teacher education: A curricular case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 9, 1, 63-79.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchmann, M. (1985). Student teaching and the transition to pedagogical thinking. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago.

Fenstermacher, G. (1980). What needs to be known about what teachers need to know? In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research. Austin, TX: University of Texas R & D Center.

Friebus, R. (1977). Agents of socialization in student teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 70, 263-268.

Gibson, R. (1976). The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 2, 241-250.

Ginsburg, M & Newman, K. (1982). Preservice teachers' evolving conceptions of inequalities in wealth and power and the role of schooling. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, New York.

Giroux, H. (1981). Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gitlin, A. & Teitelbaum, K. (1983). Linking theory and practice: The use of ethnographic methodology by prospective teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9, 3, 225-234.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Goetz, J. & LeCompte, M. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12, 51-70.

Goodman, J. (in press). Making Early Field Experience Meaningful: A Critical Approach. Journal of Education for Teaching.

Goodman, J. (1986). Teaching preservice teachers a critical approach to curriculum design: A descriptive account. Curriculum Inquiry, 16, 1.

Goodman, J. (1985). Field-based experience: A study of social control and student teachers' response to institutional constraints. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11, 1, 26-49.

Goodman, J. (1985a) What students learn from early field experiences: A case study and critical analysis. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 6, 42-48.

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 15, 3, 9-26.

Goodman, J. (1983). An analysis of the relationship between university coursework and field-based experience: A question of relevance. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, Montreal.

Goodman, J. & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teachers: A study of perspectives. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13, 2, 1-20.

Hammersley, M. (1977). Teachers perspectives. Milton Keynes, Great Britain: The Open University Press.

Hansen, J. (1979). Sociocultural perspectives on human learning: An introduction to educational anthropology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Henry, J. (1965). Culture against man. New York: Vintage.

Hoy, W. & Rees, R. (1977). The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 1, 23-26.

Iannaccone, L. (1963). Student teaching: A transitional stage in the making of a teacher. Theory and Practice, 2, 2, 73-80.

Iannaccone, L. & Button, W. (1964). Functions of student teaching: Attitude formation and initiation in elementary student teaching. Washington, D.C.: United State Office of Education Research Project No. 1026.

Janesick, V. (1978). An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom perspective: Implications for curriculum (Research Series No. 33). East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research on Teaching.

Johnston, J. & Ryan, K. (1983). Research on the beginning teacher. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), The Education of Teachers: A Look Ahead. New York: Longman.

Joyce, B., Yarger, S., Howey, K., Harbeck, K., & Kluwin, T. (1977). Perservice teacher education. Palo Alto, CA: Center for Educational Research, Stanford Univerasity.

Karnos, A & Jacko, C. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 51-55.

Lasch, C. (1975). Haven in a heartless world. New York: Basic Books.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. (1973). Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), The second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mardle, G. & Walker, M. (1980). Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In P. Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm.

Martin, R. (1984). Early field experiences what value, problems, and expectations? Paper presented at the annual Midwestern Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago.

Maslow, A. (1977). The farther reaches of human nature. Middlesex, England: Penguin.

Mazza, K. (1984). Women and teaching: Conceptualizing an introductory course on teaching. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, New Orleans.

Olesen, V. & Whittaker, E. (1968). The silent dialogue: A study in the social psychology of professional socialization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pelto, P. & Pelto, G. (1978). Anthropological research: The structure of inquiry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petty, M. & Hogben, D. (1980). Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher

Education, 6, 51-61.

Roberts, R. & Blankenship, J. (1970). The relationship between the change in pupil control ideology of student teachers and the student teacher's perception of the cooperating teacher's pupil control ideology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7, 315-320.

Salzillo, F. & Van Fleet, A. (1977). Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, 1, 27-31.

Sarason, S., Davidson, D., & Blatt, B. (1962). The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Scheffler, I. (1968). University scholarship and the education of teachers. Teachers College Record, 70, 1, 1-11.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Spradley, J. & McCurdy, D. (1972). The cultural experience: Ethnography in a complex society. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Tabachnick, B.R. & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 6, 28-36.

Taxel, J. (1982). Sensitizing students to the selective tradition in children's literature. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, New York.

Wass, H., Blume, R., Combs, A., & Hedges, W. Humanistic teacher education: An experiment in systematic curriculum innovation. Fort Collins, CO: Shield.

Weber, M. (1977). Basic sociological terms. In F. Dallmayr & T. McCarthy (Eds.), Understanding and social inquiry. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Wright, B & Tuska, S. (1968). From dream to life in the psychology of becoming a

teacher. School Review, 26, 183-193.

Yee, A. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. (1981). Reflective teaching and field-based experience in teacher education. Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 12, 4, 1-22.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Key processes in the socialization of student teachers: Limitations and consequences of oversocialized conceptions of teacher socialization. Paper presented at the annual American Educational Research Association meeting, Boston.

Zeichner, K. & Tabachnick, B.R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: Social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11, 1, 1-25.

Zeichner, K. & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching, 8 2, 95-117.